

REMARKS

Claims 5-6 and 10 have been amended. Claims 5-8 and 10 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested.

Applicant and Applicant's attorney thank the Examiner for the telephone interview on December 30, 1996. Claim 10 was discussed relative to the rejections in view of Seymour, McMaster, and Kuster. Although the Examiner did not commit to agreement, he indicated that the proposed amendments and arguments appeared persuasive. The amendments and arguments discussed are reflected in the present response.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner's comments have been considered, and amendments to claims 5-6 and 10 have been made in view of them. It is submitted that the rejections are overcome and that the claims are now definite.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious on consideration of Seymour in view of McMaster.

Seymour discloses in Figures 13-28 and accompanying discussion glass forming mechanism which includes lifting of a sheet of glass using a vacuum such that a portion of the glass may be shaped by a shaping block which also may include vacuum. The sheet of glass thereafter, however, is dropped onto a shaping mold such that the impact of the fall causes the glass sheet to bend to the curvature defined by the shaping mold.



McMaster teaches forming of glass sheets by engaging them with molds both beneath and above the glass sheet.

Claim 10 has been amended to make it clear that the first vacuum in the first suction chamber attracts the sheet of glass against the first shaping surface to "shape the sheet of glass". Then, a second vacuum in the second suction chamber at a later time attracts the sheet of glass against the second shaping surface area to "complete the shaping of the sheet of glass". After that, the sheet of glass is released onto a quenching ring. In contrast, Seymour provides for some bending of the sheet of glass as the sheet of glass is drawn by the vacuum. glass, however, is subsequently dropped onto a shaping mold which causes the final shaping of the glass sheet. Seymour does not disclose shaping a sheet of glass against a first shaping surface to be followed by attraction against a second shaping surface in order to complete the shaping. McMaster teaches shaping using molds from beneath and above the glass sheet, so it cannot be read with Seymour to logically derive the process of claim 10. The process of claim 10 has nontrivial advantage in that complete shaping takes place in a controlled fashion against shaping surfaces on one side of the glass, without requiring a dropping and possible breakage situation. Thus, claim 10 is not only distinguished from the references, but leads to nontrivial advantage. Claim 10 is nonobvious over the references.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious on consideration of Seymour in view of Kuster.



Kuster teaches the use of an annular frame to press a sheet of glass against a solid surface curving form and then using hot gas to force the sheet of glass against the form.

Kuster does not teach the part of the process of claim 10 which distinguishes claim 10 from Seymour. Consequently, claim 10 is also nonobvious in view of these references.

Claim 5-8 depend from claim 10 and add further novel limitations. Applicant does not acquiesce in the rejection of these claims. It is unnecessary, however, at this time, to further distinguish these claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested. Allowance of claims 10 and 5-8 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Tetsya Mizusugi, et al.
By their attorneys,

MERCHANT, GOULD, SMITH, EDELL WELTER, & SCHMIDT, P.A.
3100 Norwest Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-5300

Dated: February 18, 1997

Curtis B. Hamre Reg. No. 29,165